



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

MN

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/020,048	12/14/2001	Matthias Stefan Bierbrauer	DE920000125US1	7481
46320 7590 05/15/2007 CAREY, RODRIGUEZ, GREENBERG & PAUL, LLP STEVEN M. GREENBERG 950 PENINSULA CORPORATE CIRCLE SUITE 3020 BOCA RATON, FL 33487			EXAMINER LUDWIG, MATTHEW J	
			ART UNIT 2178	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 05/15/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/020,048

Applicant(s)

BIERBRAUER ET AL.

Examiner

Matthew J. Ludwig

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 February 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the Request For Reconsideration received 2/19/2007.
2. Claims 1-17 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 5, 10, and 13, are independent claims.
3. Claims 1-17 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sorge in view of Mosely have been withdrawn pursuant to applicant's amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rodriguez et al., Pat. Publication US 2002/0029228 filed(9/9/1999).**

In reference to independent claim 1, Rodriguez teaches:

If the user preferred to view a listing of files contained within the archive file, the user would click on the second hyperlink. This would result in a special request. The web server would then use the file list function and dynamic web page creation functions to create a web page containing a list of the files contained within the archive file. Also, the file listing may include icons next to or near each file name in the listing such that the user can quickly identify the types of files listed (compare to “*obtaining structural information describing structural elements of a sequential file of documents in which the single document is located*”). See page

Art Unit: 2178

3, [0030] through [0034]. The structural information is suggested in the Rodriguez reference by the organization of files and file types presented to the user in the markup language document (word processing file, video clip, and spreadsheet).

The file listing may include icons next to or near each file name in the listing such that the user can quickly identify the types of files listed, such as word processor files, video clips, and spreadsheets (compare to “*obtaining meta information describing the properties of the single document*”). The file extension associated with each file suggests meta information describing properties of the single document. See page 3, [0030] through [0033].

The file-listing page is then transmitted to the browser on the client computer, where the user reviews the list, and selects one or more files for reception. This results in one or more requests being transmitted in the method. The web server responds by executing the file extraction utilities to extract and optionally decompress the selected files from the archive file (compare to “*obtaining document content of the single document*”). See page 3, [0032].

The extracted files are then transmitted to the client computer or network client, where they are saved and/or decompressed by the appropriate software application. For files which were selected to be extracted and decompressed by the web server prior to transmission to the client computer, the proper application program on the client computer which is registered to that file type may be optionally launched to allow immediate operation on the file after it is received (compare to “*creating a physical representation for the single document based on the obtained structural information, meta information, and document content*”). See page 3, [0032] through [0033].

Art Unit: 2178

As presently claimed, the limitation 'transferring the created physical representation to the document repository' is taught by the reference to Rodriguez when it discloses, utilizing the web server to suggest a document repository. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the well-known web server storage methods and provided the dynamic creation of the file-listing page because it minimizes server storage requirements which is often a complementary requirement on servers which are storing compressed archive files.

In reference to dependent claim 2, Rodriguez teaches:

The physical representation disclosed within the reference suggests word processor files, video clips, and spreadsheets. The reference fails to explicitly state a binary format, however, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have utilized Rodriguez' extraction utilities and presented a physical representation of a binary format as the format was well-known at the time the invention was made.

In reference to dependent claim 3, Rodriguez teaches:

The document identifier is taught in the hyperlinks that suggest the URL of the individual file names, which would allow the user to indicate which files to extract and download. The URL would be included in the physical presentation if the user selected the web document. See page 3, [0029] through [0030].

In reference to dependent claim 4, Rodriguez teaches:

For files which were selected to be extracted and decompressed by the web server prior to transmission to the client computer, the proper application program on the client computer which is registered to that file type may be optionally launched to allow immediate operation on

Art Unit: 2178

the file after it is received. The term 'serialized' is presently stated within the limitation of the claim. The data read by the user device would provide suggestion of serial communication based on a given physical representation.

In reference to claims 5-9, the limitations reflect similar language for moving a single document between a document processing system and document repository as claimed in 1-4. The claims are rejected under similar rationale.

In reference to claims 10-17, the limitations reflect the system and computer program product for moving a single document between a document processing system and a document repository as claimed in 1-4. Therefore, the claims are rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J. Ludwig whose telephone number is 571-272-4127. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2178

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ML



STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER